

**Nebraska DDD/MLTC Waiver Workgroup: Provider Requirements**  
**May 27, 2016**

**Participants:** Dave Barrett, Kim McFarland, May Faith, Rene Ferdinand, Mike Baumfalk, Joan Speicher-Simpson, Erin Raabe, Sharon Johnson, Mary Lawson, Teresa Tack-Stogdill

**Notes Recorders:** Kim McFarland and Dave Barrett

**Next Meeting (date/time):** Most likely will be Friday June 24, 2016 2:00, NSOB Lower Level D; this will be determined no later than Friday June 3, 2016.

**Agenda:**

- 1) Introductions
- 2) Sign in Sheet
- 3) Questions
- 4) Review of last meeting's minutes
- 5) Clarification of workgroup mission and goals
- 6) Review of Listserv responses
- 7) Additional thoughts regarding accreditation and background checks
- 8) Administrative simplification
- 9) Next steps

Agenda Item	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
Workgroup mission and goals	Dave Barrett	Dave told the group about the workgroup's new name (Provider Requirements) and why the name and focus has changed. This is due to wanting to expand the focus to include existing providers as well as prospective providers.	N/A
Review of Listserv responses	Dave Barrett	Dave told the group about the listserv he posted on NASDDDS about three weeks ago. We received four responses, and two were helpful and detailed. These two	Dave will reply to these two responders (Alabama and Kentucky) and request

Agenda Item	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
		<p>responses (Alabama and Kentucky) were reviewed. The group identified elements of both responses that we could either pursue as options in Nebraska or ask for further clarification from these responders for future consideration. Most of the discussion centered around Kentucky's stringent and detailed provider enrollment process.</p>	<p>clarification on several items and will report those clarifications to the group.</p>
Accreditation	Dave Barrett	<p>Dave led a discussion that was a follow-up from last meeting regarding accreditation. Specifically, the discussion centered around the pros and cons of accreditation for existing providers. Since the workgroup does not have any members who use accreditation, Rene suggested contacting Kate Bolz, Director of NASP, to see if she would ask the NASP membership if any of them are or have been accredited. Dave will follow-up with Kate. The concerns that group members voiced included conflict of interest, expense, conflict between accreditation and Public Health surveyors, and duplication between surveyors and accreditation.</p>	<p>Dave will contact Kate Bolz (NASP) to see if there are any current service providers who are accredited and then get their feedback on accreditation versus certification.</p>
Background checks	Kim McFarland	<p>Kim led a discussion about background checks and what the requirements are at different levels and different divisions. For example, the contract for foster care states that background checks are done every two years, and this is Nebraska only, not federal, checks. In addition, if the foster family has lived in a different state or states in the past two years it is their responsibility to acquire background checks from the state and the counties they lived in. This process is true for non-specialized providers too. A recent state law will require that all A&amp;D waiver and chore providers are fingerprinted and</p>	<p>Kim will research the new state statute and its impact on providers statewide.</p>

Agenda Item	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
		checked by the FBI via the State Patrol at their own expense. This will impact the availability of providers, as many of them won't be able to afford the additional \$50 cost for the background checks.	
Administrative simplification	Dave Barrett and Kim McFarland	Dave and Kim led a discussion about where and how simplification can occur within not only DDD but DHHS's other divisions. Group members stated that one of the first steps needs to be identifying duplication within the divisions and eliminating that. The group members agreed that since every division does have differences in how they operate and what their focus is, there will naturally be additional things for providers to do in order to provide services across divisions. The group also discussed policy and procedure reviews during the provider enrollment stage. The group is in general agreement that P&P reviews may not be the most useful tool in determining an agency's readiness and ability to provide services. The group liked the idea of competency-based testing and modules for provider orientation. This is actually a parking lot agenda item from previous meetings, and this will continue to be addressed and considered.	N/A
Next steps	Dave Barrett and Kim McFarland	Dave asked the group if there were topics the group would like to discuss or keep discussing, beyond the topics already identified. There was strong agreement that the parking lot topics should be re-addressed, so that will be added to the next agenda. Public Health's accreditation process in different areas will be addressed.	Kim and Joan Speicher-Simpson will follow-up with details on Public Health's accreditation processes.
Next meeting		The group agreed that the next meeting most likely should be Friday June 24 <sup>th</sup> , given the planned absence of	Dave and Kim will contact the group via email about when the next meeting will be.

Agenda Item	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
		some group members in two weeks and the likely event that there will not be enough agenda items to require a meeting in two weeks. The group did delegate to Dave and Kim this decision, whether to meet in two or four weeks.	